



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,694	07/12/2001	Leigh Allen Williamson	AUS920010324US1	1615
45993 7590 03/22/2007 IBM CORPORATION (RHF) C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ P. O. BOX 23324 OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123			EXAMINER TODD, GREGORY G	
			ART UNIT 2157	PAPER NUMBER

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/902,694

Applicant(s)

WILLIAMSON ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory G. Todd

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to applicant's appeal brief filed, 02 March 2006, of application filed, with the above serial number, on 12 July 2001 in which no claims have been amended. Claims 1-15 are therefore pending in the application.

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 02 March 2006, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2157

3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin (hereinafter "Austin", 6,763,395) in view of Bowman-Amuah (hereinafter "Bowman", 6,842,906).

As per Claims 1 and 5, Austin teaches a method of and computer readable medium encoded with software for providing an extension to a default set of resource functions in an enterprise application server, said application server having a default Universal Resource Locator (URL) stream handler factory class, said method comprising the steps of:

providing one or more extension URL providers, said extension URL providers each having a specified name, description, supported protocol and stream handler class name, and classpath (different attributes for URL protocol plug-in/extension) (at least col. 18, lines 6-20; col. 2, lines 12-27; col. 8, lines 25-55);

binding a reference to one or more extension URL objects into a global namespace (at least col. 8, lines 39-55; col. 11, lines 42-47; delegating protocol scheme to plug-in);

registering said extension providers to be used by an application program in a table of parameter sets having a protocol identifier and a stream handler class identifier (at least col. 9, lines 4-16; plug-in registered to handle protocol scheme);

overriding said default URL stream handler to enable an extension URL stream handler (at least col. 8, lines 25-55; extend by installing protocol plug-ins and incorporated as default protocol scheme); and

binding one or more extension URL objects into a namespace such that said registered extension URL providers and extension URL objects are available to and for use by an application program through a naming service (at least col. 11, lines 1-19; eg. DSTP URL connecting to DataSocket server).

Austin does not explicitly teach the use of an application server. However, the use and advantages for using such a server is well known to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by the teachings of Bowman. Bowman clearly teaches the advantages of using an application server with a client (at least col. 33 lines 45 – col. 34 line 34) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the use of Bowman's application server into Austin's system as Austin teaches communicating with a web HTTP server and the server running applications and also the data socket server being a separate application running on the same machine as a data socket client (see col. 8, lines 25-38; col. 14 line 57 - col. 15 line 21; col. 18, lines 6-20), and though Austin does teach embodiments of a 'two-tiered architecture with only clients, Bowman clearly outlines the disadvantages of such a model (at least col. 33, lines 24-43) in that the client has too heavy a burden, and as such a three-tiered model with an application server is advantageous for performing the application load.

As per Claims 2, 6, and 10, as set forth in Claims 1, 5, and 9, respectively, further comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2157

executing a computer instruction by an application program to lookup a resource object by a resource name via an application server naming service (at least col. 17, lines 37-43; client deriving name of the extension); and

retrieving a bound and registered extension URL object according to said resource name (at least col. 17, lines 37-50; col. 14, lines 18-41; unique extension name used by client).

As per Claim 3, 7, and 11, as set forth in Claims 1, 5, and 9, respectively, wherein said step of providing one or more extension URL providers includes specifying a classpath as a location of a jar file (at least col. 14, lines 7-12; col. 9, lines 41-47; col. 5, lines 37-40; use of java for extension).

As per Claim 4, 8, and 12, as set forth in Claims 1, 5, and 9, respectively, wherein said step of overriding said default URL stream handler is performed by executing a Java function to set the application server's URL Stream Handler Factory to said extension URL stream handler (at least col. 5, lines 32-45; program implemented by Java objects).

As per Claim 9, Austin teaches an extensible Universal Resource Locator (URL) resource system for an enterprise application server, said enterprise application server having a default set of resource functions in an enterprise application server and a default Universal Resource Locator (URL) stream handler factory class, said extensible URL resource system comprising:

one or more extension URL providers, said extension URL providers each having a specified name, description, supported protocol and stream handler class name, and

Art Unit: 2157

classpath (different attributes for URL protocol plug-in/extension) (at least col. 18, lines 6-20; col. 2, lines 12-27; col. 8, lines 25-55);

a registry of said URL providers comprising a table having a parameter set for each URL provider, said parameter set comprising a protocol identifier and a stream handler class identifier (at least col. 9, lines 4-16; plug-in registered to handle protocol scheme);

a default URL stream handler factory overrider adapted to replace said default URL stream handler factory with an extension stream handler factory (at least col. 8, lines 25-55; extend by installing protocol plug-ins and incorporated as default protocol scheme); and

one or more bound references for one or more URL objects into a namespace such that said registered URL providers and URL objects are available to an application program via a naming service (at least col. 11, lines 1-19; DSTP URL connecting to DataSocket server).

Austin does not explicitly teach the use of an application server. However, the use and advantages for using such a server is well known to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by the teachings of Bowman. Bowman clearly teaches the advantages of using an application server with a client (at least col. 33 lines 45 – col. 34 line 34) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the use of Bowman's application server into Austin's system as Austin teaches communicating with a web HTTP server and the server running applications and also the data socket server being

a separate application running on the same machine as a data socket client (see col. 8, lines 25-38; col. 14 line 57 - col. 15 line 21; col. 18, lines 6-20), and though Austin does teach embodiments of a 'two-tiered architecture with only clients, Bowman clearly outlines the disadvantages of such a model (at least col. 33, lines 24-43) in that the client has too heavy a burden, and as such a three-tiered model with an application server is advantageous for performing the application load.

4. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin in view of Bowman, further in view of Charisius et al (hereinafter "Charisius", 2002/0104071).

Austin and Bowman fail to explicitly teach said one or more extension URL providers on an application server comprise a provider compatible with or compliant with Java 2 Enterprise Edition (J2EE) specifications;

said step of binding a reference to one or more extension URL objects into a global namespace on said application server (at least Austin col. 8, lines 39-55; col. 11, lines 42-47; delegating protocol scheme to plug-in) comprises binding into a J2EE global namespace;

said step of registering said extension URL providers comprises registering with a J2EE application server;

said step of overriding said default URL stream handler to enable an extension URL stream handler comprises overriding a J2EE URL stream handler; and

said step of binding one or more extension URL objects into an application server namespace comprises binding into a J2EE application server namespace such that said

registered extension URL providers and extension URL objects are available to and for use by a J2EE application program through an application server naming service.

However, the use and advantages for using J2EE is well known to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by the teachings of Charisius. Charisius teaches the claimed limitations including J2EE compatible specifications and application servers (see paragraphs 157, 189-196, 202-204). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of Charisius' J2EE enabled system into Austin and Bowman's system as this would allow compatibility and interoperability with the specification and guidelines of J2EE allowing proper working communications with such systems and future protocols and standards of Java as used in Austin and Bowman.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Previously cited Benjamin et al, Rutherglen et al, Joseph, Chen et al, Mehra et al, Haverstock et al, and Vance et al are cited for disclosing pertinent information related to the claimed invention. Applicants are requested to consider the prior art reference for relevant teachings when responding to this office action.

Art Unit: 2157

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory G. Todd whose telephone number is (571)272-4011. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am-6:00pm w/ first Fridays off.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571)272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory Todd 

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2100


ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100